

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Asdress O. AMISSO NER OF FATENTS AND TRADEMARKS FO Box 148. Mexandra Supris 213,30,450 www.usptc.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09 482,731	01 14 2000	Atsushi Murakami	266036	7400
75	90 05 28 2003			
Nixon & Vanderhye, P.C.			EXAMINER	
1100 North Glebe Rd, 8th Floor Arlington, VA 22201-4714			VO, HAI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	21
			DATE MAILED: 05-28-2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•	, ,	MURAKAMI ET AL.			
Advisory Action	09/482,731	Art Unit			
	Examiner Hai Vo	1771			
The MAILING DATE of this come	munication appears on the cover sheet				
	ACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDI				
Therefore, further action by the applicant final rejection under 37 CFR 1 113 may 0	is required to avoid abandonment of only be either: (1) a timely filed amend Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee): or	this application. A proper reply to a			
PE	ERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) of	or b)]			
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from					
event, however, will the statutory period for ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE F 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CF have been filed is the date for purposes of determining 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration of the content	r reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the markers REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTER 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under gother period of extension and the corresponding addate of the shortened statutory period for reply original later than three months after the mailing date of	set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no nailing date of the final rejection. ITHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP ar 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under iginally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in if the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on	Appellant's Brief must be filed w thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid of	vithin the period set forth in dismissal of the appeal.			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will n	ot be entered because:				
(a) they raise new issues that wou	uld require further consideration and/o	or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new ma					
(c) they are not deemed to place issues for appeal; and/or	the application in better form for appe	eal by materially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims NOTE:	s without canceling a corresponding n	number of finally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim canceling the non-allowable claim	· · ————	itted in a separate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or application in condition for allowar	c) I request for reconsideration has nce because: See Continuation Sheet.	been considered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be raised by the Examiner in the fina		d SOLELY to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the propo explanation of how the new or am	sed amendment(s) a) \square will not be ended claims would be rejected is pro-	ntered or b)⊠ will be entered and an ovided below or appended.			
The status of the claim(s) is (or wil	II be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed: 34 and 41					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6-15,17-21,2</u>	3-27,29-33,36-40,43 and 49-51				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consider					
	îled on is a) \square approved or b	disapproved by the Examiner.			
8. The proposed drawing correction f	iled on is a)□ approved or b closure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Pap				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The art rejections have been maintained for following reasons. The arguments that the hardness properties would not be inherently present because the secondary Ogawa reference describes the hardness of the composite 16,18, 20 is considerably higher than the 25%-compressive hardness of 0.5N/cm2 or lower as set forth in the claims are not found persuasive. Ogawa does not disclose the hardness of the rubber foam layer but rather discloses the hardness of the composite material comprising a three layer construction of a rubber foam layer and two non-foamed layers disposed on each surface of the foam layer. Applicants argue that the "foam polyethylene" or the "foam rubber" of Ogawa is harder than the material of the claimed invention since Ogawa's materials were prepared by impregnating thermosetting resin. They are not found persuasive. Ogawa reference does not exclude an embodiment where the main body portion can be made of a foam rubber without a reinforcing fiberglass. Finally, the arguments that it would be contrary to JP'865 purpose to modify the JP'865 structure are not found persuasive. Since Applicants provide no evidence to demonstrate that the rubber foam itself used in Ogawa is much softer than the polyethylene foam disclosed in the JP'865 reference, the art rejections are thus sustained.

TERREL MORRIS

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER FECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700